

With all of the above possibilities, the Government is seriously working for a disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union. But in view of what has happened in the "Geneva memorandum," can we really believe that the Communists will live up to any "solemn" agreement?

The Carthaginians did not demand proof of disarmament from the Romans. But in view of what has happened in the "Geneva memorandum," can we really believe that the Communists will live up to any "solemn" agreement?

PURSUE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ROOSEVELT'S LOGIC CITED: TAKE STRENGTH WHERE YOU FIND IT AND DEMAND VICTORY

ROME.—The percentage of U.S. expenditure which goes toward deterring Communist aggression is enormous, encompassing everything from a large standing Defense Establishment to foreign aid and the Voice of America. Yet the policies which go along with this vast expenditure are, to some, downright puzzling.

If a country has a political goal directed against an enemy, the aim would logically be its attainment through victory. Our stupendous expenditures are made against communism. Yet we read from testimony taken by the Steunls subcommittee investigating the so-called muzzling of the military that the words "enemy," "victory," etc., have been deleted from speeches made by military men.

One can gather from a series of information a possible explanation of our policy. In "CIA, the Inside Story," for instance, one comes across an enlightening message. The author quotes former CIA Director Allen Dulles:

"We support our friends," he says, "Do you suggest that we support our enemies?"

"Dulles' critics did not see this as quite so black and white. They complained that it was not enough for a foreign government or leadership to be inimical to the Kremlin; that government also should be advocate of the necessary social reforms which would buttress its country against Communist infiltration."

This is the clearest explanation of U.S. foreign policy your reporter has seen across. It explains why he has seen a local American newspaper headline, "States May Cut Off Spain Aid Grants," and just below it: "J.F.K. To Discuss Release of Aid With Congo Leader." It explains U.S. hatred of the former Batista government in Cuba, the Trujillo government in the Dominican Republic, the Syngman Rhee government in South Korea and the Salazar government in Portugal, to name a few.

While the logic of the policy is understandable, there is no logic in continuing policy after it has not only been proven on numerous occasions to be wholly unworkable but outright catastrophic to our defense posture.

In World War II President Roosevelt was not at all squeamish that our partner in the war against the Nazis was Soviet Russia, a dictatorship as bad but far more clever than the enemy's. He took an ally where he could find him. Our policy then was victory, and we had complete victory on the battlefields. But since the end of the war all our administrations have discarded the logical policies of President Roosevelt and turned thumbs down on any ally which does not have the social reforms our leaders believe they should have.

No one can sympathize with the methods of Batista in Cuba, but that island was one of the strongest bastions against our common enemy in that area. Not far away on another island we had another dedicated ally against Communist aggression, the Dominican Republic, a country without national debt, with no unemployment and militarily strong. Yet, because these two governments did not have the social reforms we insist on—did not have our pattern of democracy—we encouraged and assisted new revolutionary governments. Until recently, those two governments were strong guard-

The Carthaginians, to show their love of peace, agreed to send 300 sons of their noblest families to Rome for study. But the Romans actually had other ideas than peace. Using psychological warfare, they demanded further proof of good will, and so the Carthaginians surrendered their weapons and machines of war, together with armor for 200,000 soldiers.

When later the Romans demanded that Carthage be removed from the sea to at least 10 miles inland from the Mediterranean, this was too much. The Carthaginians decided to resist. In 146 B.C., under the leadership of Scipio Africanus, the Romans delivered the coup de grace. The great city of Carthage disappeared from all but history.

In September 1959, when Nikita Khrushchev stood before the United Nations and proposed total disarmament, he must have had in mind that phase of history. Although disarmament had been a Soviet line since the atomic bombs were dropped in 1945, this was the first big push of the line. The Red dictator not only demanded "general and complete disarmament," but proposed that "military educational establishments would be closed."

Others of his demands were "the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests for all time," and "the establishment of an international control body comprised of all states. Military bases on foreign territory to be dismantled; the states would retain only strictly limited contingents of police (militia) agreed for each country."

To the general unsuspecting public, all this seemed ridiculous and preposterous in the light of present history. But the Soviets knew what they were doing. The Kremlin published a small document which after a short preamble, assembled the points made by the Soviet dictator into three stages.

Perhaps by the fall of 1961 the American public had forgotten all about Mr. Khrushchev's rantings about disarmament—and had certainly not seen the three-stage declaration. When at that time President Kennedy addressed the United Nations with an American proposal for total disarmament, the press made no comparison with the previous Khrushchev proposals.

Today the State Department is distributing a small document "For General and Complete Disarmament." Assembled in three stages, the only feature it adds to its Soviet prototype is the proposal for a "J.N. peace force." By the time stage three is arrived at, it claims, the world will be living under international law.

The State Department's document for disarmament takes no consideration of the sincerity of the Soviets. There is some grilling about Mr. Kennedy not ordering a resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests. The truth is that we are not ready for it. During the Geneva memorandum the Russians worked assiduously preparing for such tests. And when they were ready they surprised the world with their explosion. Throughout this time we had observed scrupulously the terms of the memorandum. And now, when the time has come when we must work out a disarmament program, we are ready. It is to be hoped that the parallel with Carthage is not accurate, since

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, for many years I have been impressed with the writing ability of Mr. Constantine Brown and also with his dedication and devotion toward preserving our national freedom against the onslaught of Communist aggression and subversion at home and abroad. In writing from Rome, Italy, Mr. Brown has recently had published in the Evening Star of February 15, 17, and 20 three excellent columns which merit the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the Record. There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE SOVIET PROGRAM TO DISARM US—CARTHAGE'S FATE AT ROME'S HANDS CITED AS THE UNITED STATES TALKS OF DISARMAMENT ROME.—If the Dominican Republic were to go the way of Castro's Cuba; if Laos and Vietnam go the way of China; if Turkey goes the way of Nasser; if Iran goes the way of Iraq; if Katanga goes the way of the Congo; if West Germany adopts coexistence; if Portugal goes the way of the old Dominican Republic; if Italy becomes "neutralist"; if Formosa becomes a United Nations trusteeship; if Latin America becomes unbridled in Communist-inspired revolutions—where will the United States be?

To include a further "If—if the administration's proposals for total disarmament are successful and the Soviets give up their policy to them the answer is that our Nation would not even be a 'Fortress America'."

2020000